

gifted children—Michael, Mary Beth and Trish. Their grandchildren & great grandchildren pay tribute to their lifetime of love and devotion.

Pat was an artist in every sense of the word. She accepted commissions and she created formal portraits, such as of professors and administrators at the University of Toledo and Ohio State University. Families commissioned her to depict a mother with a baby or a montage of family scenes. On occasion, she was asked on short notice to do a portrait that could be displayed at a wake or funeral service. She created the familiar picture, "Daughter Too," of the pig-tailed girl eating an apple on the side of Al Peake & Sons & Daughter Too produce trucks.

"Her biggest strength as an artist was she really captured the likeness," her daughter Mary Beth said. "A friend of hers stopped by and said, 'She captured the spirit.'"

Mrs. Beazley worked primarily in pastel, though she was versed in other media.

"She enjoyed anything from the still lifes to the flowers," her son said. "Her line of pencil drawings she used to call 'captured moments.' She always took joy in the craft and a special pride in the reactions of the families she did work for."

Her work has been selected for the annual Toledo Area Artists Exhibition at the Toledo Museum of Art and for a Pastel Society of America exhibition and has been included in other shows at the museum and through the Athena Art Society and other groups. She received a Grumbacher Bronze Medallion, and at several exhibitions, her works were deemed best-of-show.

Her mother was an amateur artist, but Mrs. Beazley did not take an art class until she was 39. She actively resisted training as a child, she told *The Blade* in 1981, because "I just knew I wasn't good enough."

She also was active at Gesu Church and volunteered for the League of Women's Voters—she produced a public television program featuring debates among local candidates—and on behalf of civil rights.

She'd painted a mural on the kitchen wall when the family lived in Chicago. She began sketching.—See more at: <http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/toledoblade/obituary.aspx?n=patricia-beazley&pid=169562150&sthash.VEUvWBOk.dpuf>

A "CLEAN" DEBT CEILING: A DIRTY DEAL FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, sometime in the very near future, we are going to have to vote on an increase in the national debt. The national debt ceiling is currently at \$17 trillion, and all expectations are that the increase will put it up over \$18 trillion or at least \$17.5 trillion.

It is unconscionable to me that one of the largest items already in our budget is the interest on the national debt, and that it is also one of the fastest growing items in the budget. I will not vote, Mr. Speaker, for a so-called "clean" debt ceiling, because I think that is a dirty deal for the American people.

It is time to begin structural changes to our entitlement programs that make them subject to some sort of caps so that we can get back to balance and

keep our budget in balance. This is one of those inflection points in American history, and I hope that the House of Representatives will insist on real reform in our budget before we vote to increase the public debt by one penny.

MIAMI-DADE TEACHER OF THE YEAR MYRNA BETANCOURT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased tonight to rise to congratulate a Miami teacher who is going above and beyond for our south Florida students.

Myrna Betancourt, a culinary arts teacher at the South Dade Educational Center, is Miami-Dade County's 2015 Teacher of the Year.

Working out of her kitchen in the Chapman Partnership Homeless Center in Homestead, Myrna is giving hundreds—thousands—of often disadvantaged, special needs or homeless Miami students a second chance at life. A former social worker and public school teacher, Myrna has always wanted to help those in need. Thanks to her hard work, Myrna's chefs are learning to cook gourmet foods, are finding jobs in good restaurants, and are receiving scholarships at the finest culinary schools in our country. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, Myrna is giving them hope and an opportunity to follow their dreams.

Congratulations, Myrna. South Florida is also very proud of you.

CONGRATULATIONS WALLA WALLA VALLEY

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take time to recognize the beautiful Walla Walla Valley and the 30th anniversary of their Federal designation as an American Viticultural Area.

Over the past 30 years, the Walla Walla Valley has earned national and international recognition for being one of the best wine regions in the world. Just ask Gary and Nancy Figgins, who opened Leonetti Cellar in 1984 when there were just four wineries in the valley. Today, within 1,800 acres of green, rolling hills, you will find 130 different wineries.

This growth has allowed businesses to expand and the wine tourism to become one of the top industries in our State. Our community has rallied around the business owners, and now wine-related jobs account for nearly 15 percent of the total jobs in the area. All of this leads to a \$500 million economic impact, but it is not just the numbers, as it is about a community that makes us all proud in Washington State to call it our home.

I am honored to represent the Walla Walla Valley, and congratulations on

30 exceptional years. Best wishes for many, many more to come.

□ 1930

SHAME ON YOU

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today, once again, the President has unilaterally, almost like a monarch, said ObamaCare is the law.

The fact is HARRY REID and the Senate were willing to shut down the government instead of just passing a bill that would have suspended ObamaCare for a year—or, at least suspend the mandates—and he did it again today.

So it makes it very clear the shutdown of our government that hurt so many people was clearly a political game by HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats because they wanted America to hurt—and blame the Republicans—when all along they were willing to agree to what we offered to avoid the shutdown.

Shame on you.

CONFLATING THE TERMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I have a number of things that I would like to bring to your attention that are on my mind and I think are on the minds of the American people.

The number one topic in this Capitol Building, at least on the House side right now—and I believe on the Senate side, too—is the question of the debt ceiling that has been brought forward. A lot of us have some memories of how difficult that was the last time that came through.

There are a good number of Members in this Congress that have pledged they will never vote to increase the debt ceiling. We have a President who used extraordinary methods the last time and stretched the debt ceiling out and the crunch time that was supposed to come for months. And it is curious that even though the Congress did backfill that debt ceiling for him, now he doesn't have any extraordinary means, evidently, and now we are up against the time line, up against the wall of perhaps a February 15 date. It causes this Congress to have to scramble.

It is not because this government is in risk of default, Mr. Speaker. That is the language that emerged 2 or 3 years ago on the debt ceiling. Republicans and Democrats alike talked about how this country's credit is good and we can't allow our government to default.

The definition of default really isn't what has been used in this dialogue

over the debt ceiling. The default would be if the United States could not and failed to service its debt. That would be if we didn't have the revenue stream to pay the interest and to roll the bonds over, then we would be in default. We are a long, long way from that, Mr. Speaker. We have, by some measurements, as much as 8 or 9 or 10 times the revenue necessary to pay the interest and roll the bonds over.

So America is not in danger of default, but we are in danger of getting confused about the debate and losing track of the essence of it because we allow language to be conflated in the minds of the American people, the minds of the people in the House and the Senate, and in the press. The press allows that to happen as well. And when language gets conflated, we lose the center of the argument.

To drive that point home, Mr. Speaker, I would say this. About 6 or 7 years ago, I noticed that the language was being conflated between health care and health insurance. I recall our then-Governor to the State of Iowa came here in this very building. We had a meeting with the Iowa congressional delegation and the Governor, and he pressed us around the table, seven of us at the time—five House Members and two Senators—and he said, There are 40,000 kids in Iowa that don't have health care.

No one said anything. I looked at him and I said, Governor, there can't be 40,000 kids in Iowa that don't have health care. We are taking care of those kids. Why have I not heard about kids without health care?

He said, No, there are 40,000 kids in Iowa without health care.

And I brought it back to him again. They all have access to health care. If nothing else, in the emergency room they are going to have access to health care. We would not turn a child away—not from a clinic, not from a hospital, not from an ER.

And we went around and around five or six times with that verbiage of the Governor saying 40,000 kids don't have health care and me saying that can't be true, hoping that I could get him to be the guy that figured out that he really meant health insurance, not health care.

I had to explain it to him, Mr. Speaker. There is a difference. What you really mean is there are 40,000 kids—at the time—in Iowa that didn't have their own health insurance policy, which is far different than not having health care.

But you see what has happened. The language was already conflated in his mind and he couldn't separate them apart, even at a meeting with the Iowa congressional delegation where he was pitching for more resources to go into the program.

And so if that happens in the mind of a Governor of the State of Iowa, I have to believe it happens in the minds of a lot of other people across the country. And then I have to wonder, did this

happen by accident? Did the language get conflated by accident, or were there people that wanted to advance a policy and they decided we are going to conflate this language because it helps our liberal agenda?

Well, it is the latter. It helps the liberal agenda to conflate the language. They did so on health insurance and health care, and that is just a model.

The next piece of this would be the example that happens with immigration.

Now, we know that there is a difference between illegal immigrants and legal immigrants. There is a tremendously different moral underpinning of this. I don't know anyone in this Congress that isn't very supportive of legal immigrants. And all of us who took an oath to uphold the Constitution should be for enforcing the rule of law even as they set about trying to change it.

But the term "immigrant," which connotes a legal immigrant, and the adjective "illegal" immigrant are entirely different. They have been conflated, because when you use the term "immigrant" interchangeably with "illegal immigrant," it suits the argument of the people who are for the open borders lobby and for amnesty.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, they have intentionally conflated the terms so that they can move their agenda, because it makes it harder to debate the distinctions if you have to stop and define the difference between "immigrant" and "illegal immigrant."

And then, of course, they argue that we shouldn't use that terminology—even "illegal immigrant." We should use "undocumented" or "not yet granted amnesty." Oh, wait. That wouldn't be theirs, Mr. Speaker. But you get the point. You conflate the terms "illegal immigrant" and "immigrant," and then you give the moral standing of the immigrant to the illegal immigrant; and then you can make the argument that you should grant them amnesty because somehow they should have access to American citizenship and all the benefits thereof.

It is a similar argument that comes along with "health care" and "health insurance." By conflating the two terms, they convinced the American people—at least a significant number of them—that everybody has not only a right to health care, but everybody has a right to their own health insurance policy.

These are a far cry from what our Founding Fathers laid out as rights. And, by the way, they are even a far cry from what Franklin Delano Roosevelt laid out as the four new freedoms. When I go down and look at the Roosevelt monument, it gives me a bit of a creepy feeling thinking how he manufactured freedoms that didn't come from God but fit a liberal agenda—even then.

So we have got the terminology of "health care" and "health insurance" and "immigrant" and "illegal immigrant" conflated, and now we are in

the debt ceiling debate, and people on both sides of the aisle are arguing that we can't allow the United States to default. Their definition of "default" is the moment that the United States runs out of borrowing capacity, which isn't the same, because the cash flow still comes flowing in, hundreds of billions of dollars a month, which is plenty of money to service the interest and to pay the debt.

We are not up against a hard break here, Mr. Speaker. We are not up against a deadline that says that if we can't get credit at the bank, we are going to have the house foreclosed on. That is not it at all. It is a matter of where we take the money from to service our debt and what bills we pay.

I do think that the inertia of the spending and the structure of the budget that we have pushes this Congress towards a debt ceiling increase at some point. But the House of Representatives has the majority of Republicans for a reason. It is because the American people rose up in 2010 and said, You are shoving too much government on us. We want to keep our God-given liberty. We want to reject ObamaCare. We want to have a smaller government with less taxes and less spending and less regulation, less intrusion, less nanny state, more freedom, more God-given liberty.

That is what the American people said in 2010.

They reiterated it again in 2012 with regard to the House of Representatives. And with the President, Mr. Speaker, they evidently decided that they wanted a President that would perhaps send them an Obama phone and maybe pick up the rent check and the heat bill and the grocery bill without that much responsibility.

I don't know that the American people were looking down the line to see that if they push this debt off into the next generation, it is their children and their grandchildren that will be paying the debt in the next generation.

When I go to a high school and talk to the high school students, invariably they will say to me, What are you going to do about the cost of tuition and what are you going to do about the cost of my student loan?

They are planning to go to college, and I am glad they are.

The answer to that and the answer I give them is, The best thing that can be done for the increasing cost of tuition is for you, the consumer, to make an astute choice on where you will go to school and the best education you can get for the tuition dollar. Calculate that. Go visit the schools. Don't think that you are going to pay a premium because you want a certain kind of sheepskin hanging in a frame on the wall someday and believe that you can put your feet on the desk and live happily ever after.

The world doesn't work that way. Not that often, in any case, Mr. Speaker.

Instead, go evaluate the tuition costs and the cost of housing and all of the

associated costs with a college education and bargain for the best buy that you can get, and go there and get that education.

If you are determined that you want a degree from a prestigious institution, you can start a 4-year degree there. Maybe you will spend 5 years getting that degree. Or you can go to a smaller institution that is maybe closer to home and a little cheaper, get a couple years in, maybe a third year in, and transfer to that 4-year school. You can achieve that degree and put it in the frame with less dollars and maybe get more back in return for the tuition dollar.

Be good consumers is the piece advice that I would give to the students looking at going to college. That is one of the educational components of where we are going with this country. But the debt that is there for an individual is the debt of the country in its aggregate.

When I tell the students that this is how you get the best buy for your dollar, they say, What are you going to do to buy down the interest rate on my student loan?

My answer to that is, If we do that, we have to borrow the money here in Congress from maybe the Chinese, maybe the Saudis, maybe the American people. About half of this U.S. debt, this \$17.3 trillion, is held in the hands of the American people in the form of Treasury bonds, et cetera. And so if we have to borrow the money to buy down your interest rate, you are going to be the one paying it back. You get your college education; you go off into the workforce; you start paying down the interest and the principal on your student loan; you are the one paying it back. If we borrow the interest rate down now, you still have to pay back your student loan, maybe at a lower interest rate, but you are going to be paying back the national debt as the other part of that bargain.

I have a number of grandchildren, all of them tremendous gifts and miracles in their own right, but the most recent two are the ones that I happened to have actually kept the math on. My little granddaughter Reagan is 3 years old. When she came into the world, her share of the national debt was \$48,000.

□ 1945

Little Wallace, the youngest, who has been here since, oh, back in mid-November, his share of the national debt when he came into the world was \$54,000. Three years apart. If we are gifted with another grandchild, you know their share of the national debt is going to be greater and greater.

This Congress needs to understand and think about our duty to the succeeding generations. Maybe it is an easy enough thing to pass a debt ceiling increase here to pacify a President who refuses to take on entitlement reform.

We all know that this debt is out of control. The spending is out of control.

The spending is on auto-pilot, and the spending is going into programs like Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security.

By the way, the latter of the three is the one that is the easiest to fix, and if we could get our employment up, we could get Social Security back on track easier than any other way. The reform of entitlements is a necessary thing if we are ever going to get this country to balance.

So the question emerges to me and others, Mr. Speaker: What would you attach to a debt ceiling increase, a debt ceiling increase that would satisfy the President which, apparently, would be an entire year, a credit card for an entire year at whatever limit that might be? What would you attach to that to send the message, to hang on to something that you can point to and say, I focused on fiscal restraint?

What could be that list of items?

Well, one would be, and my Number 1 item, Mr. Speaker, that I would attach, and this would get me to vote for a limited debt ceiling increase, would be this: a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution passed out of the House of Representatives, passed out of the United States Senate, messaged to the States.

I would step up and take a real good look, depending on the terms of it, of course, at voting for a debt ceiling increase under those conditions.

Now, the balanced budget amendment to our Constitution would have to include, in my view, it would need to include a cap on the GDP spending. I would cap it at 18 percent.

Another would be that we would have to be able to waive that balanced budget requirement in the case of a declared war, and we have got some language, or a very serious national emergency. Those would be some provisions.

No tax increases without a supermajority, another provision.

A balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution that enforces fiscal responsibility from this point forward, provided that the States would ratify that constitutional amendment.

Now, Congress could pass a balanced budget amendment out of here with a two-thirds majority, out of the House and out of the Senate and message it to the States. That is all that we can ask out of here. The States then pick the balance up from there.

Meanwhile, a debt ceiling increase would pass, I believe, out of this Congress, and the 38 States required to ratify a balanced budget amendment, I believe they would step forward and do that, because, after all, they do have balanced budget requirements within their Constitutions, almost all of them, a balanced budget requirement, and we see how they live within their means.

I worked in the State senate in Iowa for 6 years. We made our way to balance the budget sometimes when it was painful, but we knew we had no choice and, therefore, you carve that budget to match. You live within your means.

Tax increases come hard. In fact, we have reduced taxes, not increased taxes. Now we have a surplus.

I mentioned the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution as a requirement before we could vote for a debt ceiling increase. I don't know if that appetite exists here in this Congress.

I make the point to you, Mr. Speaker, because I think more need to think about the merits of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Another component that we could attach to a debt ceiling increase would be a requirement to audit the Fed. Now, that is something that has had a lot of signatures on it here in the House of Representatives. When Ron Paul served here in the House, he pushed that constantly. Yes, we have passed it out of the House of Representatives in the past, and they don't have an interest in taking it up in the Senate.

We don't know what is going on in the Fed. There are trillions of dollars that are maneuvered around over the course of years, and we aren't able to take a look at those dollars, and our job is oversight.

So when you give the Fed, essentially, an open checkbook and they can inject funds into the economy, and they can run the throttle on our economy up and down without congressional oversight, without even having access to that information to see what they are doing—the closest we get to auditing the Fed is to read *The Wall Street Journal* that picks up little tidbits and writes it into the newspaper, that gives us a better feel of what is going on.

Thanks to *The Wall Street Journal*, Mr. Speaker, but that is not enough. We do need to audit the Fed. It is a no-brainer from where I sit. Congress has an oversight responsibility. We should do so, and we should not be inhibited or held back.

It is too bad that something as simple and as clear, with the kind of support that auditing the Fed has, you would even have to think about attaching it to a debt ceiling increase in order to try to get that done and get a Presidential signature.

The President doesn't want Congress to know what is going on in the Fed, and he will resist this.

There has been a consistent pattern, Mr. Speaker, of the Majority Leader in the United States Senate being a shield for the President of the United States.

Each time we move an idea that is a good idea from the voice of the American people—by definition, when it comes out of this Congress it is the voice of the American people by virtue of the republican form of government, which is guaranteed to us in the Constitution, I might add, Mr. Speaker.

But the Majority Leader in the Senate puts up the shield if the President doesn't want to see it on his desk. Then the debate stops because the President of the United States has a blocking agent, the Majority Leader in the United States Senate.

So here we sit in the House making argument after argument, as I am doing tonight, Mr. Speaker, arguing for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, arguing that we should audit the Fed, arguing that raising the debt ceiling without restraints feeds spending and accelerates the accumulation of debt.

By the way, you just heard a few minutes ago, Mr. GOHMERT talk about the President, again, altering or amending his own bill, ObamaCare.

Now, think of this. I came here an innocent neophyte who just simply studied and read this Constitution for a good number of years, and carried one in my pocket longer than I have been in this Congress. Each day that I had a jacket I kept it in my jacket pocket, and the times that I was in the Iowa senate, and that is getting to be a few years ago now, Mr. Speaker.

When I took an oath to uphold this Constitution, and I actually remember where I was sitting right over there when that took place the first time here, and I never imagined that article I responsibilities that give the authority for legislation to the Congress would be so usurped by the President of the United States.

Article I, section 1, all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, there is no mention in this Constitution about the President involved in legislation. It says all legislative powers herein granted.

Well, where do these powers come from?

They come from God, granted to the people, and we, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, established this Constitution of the United States of America, and all legislative powers are vested in the Congress.

Article I, not article II or article III, this Federal Government, this contractual guarantee called the Constitution of the United States, was put together with the first respect for the people of the United States of America and the laws that they would ask to be passed through their republican form of government, their representatives here in the House and in the Senate.

Yet, the President, who gave a lecture a couple of years ago, on March 28, I remember the date—it might have been 2011—at a school just here in Washington, D.C., at a high school, and he was talking about the Constitution.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, that the President is a former adjunct law professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago, a very highly respected and revered school, especially their law school, and their school of economics as well.

I have great respect for the people who have gone through law school at the University of Chicago. I have met a good number of them, and the ones that I have met, they have been smart,

they have been good people. They understood the Constitution. They had good judgment.

Some of them were in the classroom—I circled by six or seven of them one evening—in the classroom of Barack Obama when he was teaching constitutional law, and they told me that each time that they reverted back to the clear letter of the Constitution, the clear meaning of the Constitution, that Adjunct Professor Obama would stretch it out and turn it over into an activist interpretation.

It is pretty interesting to hear that, but this President knew what he was doing when he spoke to the high school here in this city, March 28, I believe, 2011. He said, you are good students; you know this. The Congress writes the laws, and I am the executive branch, so my job is to see to it that the laws are enforced, and then the courts interpret the laws.

Pretty clear. That is what he said. It was an accurate interpretation of the Constitution, of articles I, II and III of our Constitution. He knows the Constitution, he has taught it.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, he steps forward and violates his own oath of office and seeks to legislate by executive edict. I don't use that first word, executive order, Mr. Speaker, because occasionally it is an executive order, but sometimes it is a press conference; sometimes it is the President's people, on a third-tier U.S. Treasury Web site, announcing that there has been some change in Federal policy that effectively amends Federal law.

Now, Presidents are required to take their oath of office, it is in this Constitution, by the way, and inclusive within that oath is the Take Care Clause, that the President's obligation is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is a component of the oath that he gives when he swears in out here on the west portico of the Capitol on January 20, every leap year. We hear that oath.

So when the President of the United States doesn't enforce the laws that have been passed by the Congress, messaged to a previous President, signed by a previous President, and go into the Federal Code, when the President doesn't enforce those laws, if he says he disagrees with the laws that have been passed before he arrived at the west portico and took the oath of office, that is a constitutional violation. That is a violation of his oath of office. That is the reason that he takes it, is so we can compel him to follow the Constitution.

This President not only has refused to enforce the laws that were on the books when he became President—and it is multiple cases. The President has refused to enforce the law when it comes to Welfare to Work. There is only one component of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs that we have that requires work.

That was the big deal that emerged during the mid-nineties, when we had

Welfare to Work, and there were two or three vetoes by President Clinton, who finally took credit for signing Welfare to Work.

Only one of the 80 requires work, and that one the President willfully, simply disregarded, and so he ended Welfare to Work. After all of the bare-knuckle fights here in this Congress and the vetoes and the Presidential positioning and the politics that went into it, President Obama just wiped out Welfare to Work, willy nilly, even though it was written carefully so that a President couldn't ignore the work component of Welfare to Work and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families component of welfare. That is one violation.

Then we had the President just simply set aside No Child Left Behind. That was Teddy Kennedy's piece that he negotiated with George W. Bush. President Obama decided I don't like No Child Left Behind, kicked that one off the table. I am going to ignore it, and you all can ignore it because I, essentially, direct you to.

Then we get to the immigration component of this, and there are five pieces of the—we call it the Morton Memos, where the President has decided that he is refusing to enforce existing immigration law, and they argue that it is on an individual basis only.

There were seven different references to an individual basis only by Janet Napolitano, who testified before the Judiciary Committee. That is in there, Mr. Speaker, so that they can argue that it is not creating a class of people that are now exempted from the law. Well, they create classes of people and they exempt them from the law.

That is the immigration piece of the violations. Now it brings me to ObamaCare, and on ObamaCare, I can't keep track of the times that he has decided that he is not going to enforce ObamaCare and he is going to change it or amend it. The list is so full at this point I don't know if anyone has memorized how many violations, how many changes that have come to the ObamaCare law because of the President's executive edicts that come down.

I would lay the foundation of this, Mr. Speaker, in the passage of ObamaCare itself, and in the Stupak amendment, and I would like to take that discussion up in a moment.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am slightly mystified by that. But in any case, I will try to be aware of that comment.

To take us back to ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would be happy to pick it up at this point. So we have a President who was, of course, involved in the negotiations with the passage of ObamaCare, and the question became

whether they could put the votes together to pass it here on the floor of the House of Representatives because it was clear to us that ObamaCare was going to fund abortions. So what emerged from that was a group of Democrats known at the time as the “Stupak dozen,” who conditioned their support for the bill upon a provision, which became the Stupak amendment, that would prohibit abortions funded under ObamaCare or required under ObamaCare.

Well, as that debate ensued, the message became clear that the White House was negotiating that the President would simply sign an executive order that amended ObamaCare after it passed, after the fact, and that would fix the Stupak problem. That is the shorthand version, Mr. Speaker, of what took place.

But in any case, it was a bit breath-taking to hear that we had a President in the White House who believed that he could sign an executive order to amend legislation after the legislation passed and announce that he was going to do so, which was a condition for it to get the votes in order for it to pass.

Now, I know that there are people at home that are listening, Mr. Speaker, to whom that sounds like a lot of legalese gibberish, but it is the fact of what happened. The President, according to the press, had promised that he was going to amend ObamaCare by executive order after the fact; so, therefore, the Stupak language would remain in tact, even though it was to be stripped out in the Senate. That is essentially what happened, Mr. Speaker, and we ended up with ObamaCare that imposes funding of abortion in all but a very few cases.

To give an example, here in the House of Representatives, we are compelled to sign up for ObamaCare. If there was a way out of it, I would have found it. And there were 112 different programs to look at. And of those, there were only nine that didn't fund abortion; and of those nine, eight of them didn't cover me. So it came down to this Member was compelled to sign up for ObamaCare, pay essentially the doubling of my contribution to the premium, and it was the tripling of my deductibles for the only policy that, at least reportedly, didn't fund abortion.

Now, we had to dig pretty deeply. And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, for digging that up and giving us at least that much foundation, or I would have had to buy a pig in a poke, Mr. Speaker. I know that is going on across the country in many, many places.

But my point on this is that the President cannot constitutionally amend legislation by executive order, edict, press conference, or a third-tier Web site announcement from the Department of the United States Treasury. None of those things are consistent with the Constitution. And as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMERT) said in his previous discussion,

in his 1-minute about a half-hour ago now, he continues to make alterations not to somebody else's legislation—that is bad enough. I mean, it is all the same kind of constitutional violation, in my view.

But when the President decides that he is going to amend ObamaCare that has got his name on it—that is his bill; he signed it—how can he, with a straight face, step up and say, I am going to change it on the fly; I am going to delay the employer mandate; I am going to delay the individual mandate; I am going to waive this; I am going to waive that; I am going to set different provisions for businesses that have 50 employees and those that have 99 employees and those that are large businesses?

And I remember also, when he stepped up in a press conference out at the White House after he had taken a couple weeks of grief for the conscience protection violations that were supposedly in the bill that Kathleen Sebelius' rules eliminated, and that was a requirement that religious organizations, as well, had to provide policies and insurance that covered contraceptives, abortifacients, sterilizations.

Contraceptives, Mr. Speaker, people understand. Abortifacients are abortion-causing drugs. Sterilizations, we know what these are. These were requirements in the rule embodied within the rule that HHS rolled out. And after 2 weeks of the religious organizations making the case against that, the President did his press conference at noon on a Friday, and he stepped up to the podium, and he said, I am going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations, an accommodation. They don't want to provide these things. So now, he said, I am going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free.

The President of the United States had the audacity to step up to the podium and say, I am going to require the insurance companies now to fund contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations for free.

Now, that is pretty interesting because maybe it just got lost in the language. Maybe the President was really talking about he was going to agree, and he was going to ask Congress if Congress would actually change the law. Maybe he thought that he was going to have Kathleen Sebelius publish a different rule that would go out for comment, and once it followed the administrative procedures, it could have the force and effect of law if it fit within the language of the ObamaCare legislation. Maybe, maybe, maybe, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we could give the President the benefit of the doubt.

Trust, but verify. So I went back and checked the rules, the rules that had been published, that compelled the religious organizations to follow the path of all of the others to provide for abortifacients and sterilizations and contraceptives, and the President's announcement that he was going to

change things now and make an accommodation to the religious organizations and require that these things be provided for free from the insurance companies. And you would think there would have been a proposal for an amendment, a bill to amend ObamaCare in Congress. You would think there would be a change in the rules. But, Mr. Speaker, nothing changed in the rules. There wasn't an “i” dotted differently. There wasn't a “t” crossed differently. But the insurance companies began to line up behind the verbal edict of the President. That is breathtaking in scope when you think of it.

When you read this Constitution where it says, “all legislative powers.” It doesn't say all legislative powers, except those assumed by the President under certain circumstances, if he so chooses. It says, “all legislative powers.” And yet the President is legislating by announcements on Web sites, by directing his people to change the rules, by verbal press conference that changed nothing, no rules. And he has the temerity to wave his pen at us and say, I have a cell phone, and I have a pen; I don't need the Congress—and to make that same statement from the rostrum back here, Mr. Speaker.

So I am very concerned about our Constitution and the violations of it. But the President has time after time after time made changes to ObamaCare. It is bad law, and I don't accept the constitutional decision that came down from the Supreme Court. It has got a clear and stark contradiction in it that one day I hope goes back to the Court to be reviewed again.

But in any case, we have got to adhere to this Constitution. We give an oath to uphold the Constitution, as does the President. It is our job to preserve, protect, and defend it.

And here we are, faced with a debt ceiling increase. And the reasons that we might be supportive of that increase are, in the short term, it gets people off the hook in the short term. But I want a balanced budget amendment attached to it. If we don't get that, let's audit the Fed. If we don't get that, then I would say, here is something we all ought to get behind: eliminate the bailout of our insurance companies.

Our insurance companies wrote into ObamaCare that they would be protected from a stop-loss, essentially protected from loss if their actuarial numbers and their premiums don't match up.

Now, it would be impossible for them to figure this out because the President has been changing this law all along. Most all of the changes have been unconstitutional. I would bet the clearest one would be when the President of the United States decided that he was going to extend the employer mandate for a year.

Now, the law that was signed by President Barack Obama says that the employer mandate shall commence in each month after December of 2013.

That means it must start January 2014. We should be in the second month of the employer mandate. And I am happy enough for the policy to change. I don't think it ever should be implemented. If they bring that extension to this Congress, I would vote for an extension to delay the employer mandate for a year because that is probably the right kind of policy.

We didn't get that before this Congress. Instead, the President just announced he was going to extend it. And I happen to have been on a bit of a trip when the notice came that he was going to do some delays of the individual mandate, and I remember sending an email off to one of the top insurance companies, Is anybody there talking about the constitutional violations? The answer that came back was, Well, not very much. But, yes, he is sure they are talking about them. My answer was, Merry Christmas.

This is what we get for Christmas, the President rewriting ObamaCare at will. It is ever-changing.

Months ago, a search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, Mr. Speaker, that I said nobody knows what the law is. Nobody knows what ObamaCare, the law ObamaCare is because it keeps changing. And of the thousands of pages of regulations that are piled on top of it, on the 2,700 pages of legislation altogether, it has been changed over and over again. Insurance companies can't abide by these changes. They can't adjust their premiums. And yet they wrote into the bill the risk corridors. And they say to me, But we have to have this because, after all, if ObamaCare is going to be here, we can't be going broke if the President changes the law on us again. That has kind of compressed the discussion.

And I say to them, Were you for or against ObamaCare when it passed? Their answer is, Well, hmm—they might check their shoe shine when they answer. And they will say, Well, our choice was either to be at the table or on the menu. So I am supposed to infer, and the proper inference is, they were at the table.

The large insurance companies in the country, they weren't just at the table; they were at the White House. They decided they didn't want to be on the menu, so they got to the table at the White House and they negotiated their risk corridors, their bailout that protects them from losing money under ObamaCare—or at least losing very much money under ObamaCare.

Well, if they weren't on the menu—they were at the table instead—who was on the menu, Mr. Speaker? And I would argue that, instead of the insurance companies being on the menu, it was the taxpayers that got put on the menu. And we ended up with risk corridors, the bailout for the insurance companies, because they wanted to stay in the large insurance business. And they believe that if they can get the taxpayers to fund the premiums, it is a more reliable premium funding

stream than if you have to get that from the individual ratepayers; and also, it was designed to put 30 million more people on the insurance roles.

So whoever is in the business of expanding their business and trying to get a margin—and I have not been an anti-insurance person. I have paid a lot of premiums and have stepped up and done so willingly. They are an important component of the stability in a free enterprise economy. All insurance is, as a matter of fact.

But when they drew that protection and wrote that protection in—the stop-loss protection called risk corridors—the bailout for the insurance companies into ObamaCare, somebody was going to pick up the tab. That is the taxpayers. It expanded their potential universe to 30 million more insureds, 30 million more premiums. And, of course, there is a profit margin in that, and that is what they are in the business of doing.

Well, you expand the premiums to that 30 million, and the design that came out of ObamaCare was that we were going to see more insured. And at this point, I would lay the wager down, Mr. Speaker, that there are fewer people insured today in this country than there were the day that ObamaCare was signed into law, and we are losing people continually. And as we see what employers are going to do as they watch this, the employer mandate kick in over time—delayed now—more employers are going to be dropping people from insurance. More employers are cutting hours. More employers are reducing the number of employees.

I happen to know of an employer that had 58 employees, and he lined them up and said, If ObamaCare is passed into law and implemented, there will be 49 of you, not 58.

That had to have happened all across the country, businesses that shrunk down to under the 50 mandate, businesses that decided not to grow into that 50 employees where they are mandated to cover their insurance.

□ 2015

That is the fact of this life if you have more than those in employees, and then the formerly 40-hour workweek, which has been used to measure a full-time worker, was reduced under ObamaCare to 30 hours—30 hours, not 40. So we ended up with people that are getting 28 hours, that are working 28 hours a week so they are underneath the mandate, and the employer then who can't afford the premiums often for the higher cost health insurance can keep his employees on.

So here are the circumstances. There might be somebody that has got a job, and they could be working let's just say about 48 or 50 hours a week, a little overtime, time and a half overtime on that—I have done the math on this, Mr. Speaker—but running in at about 50 hours a week. The employer looks at that and says, I can't afford the health insurance. This Federal mandate is ei-

ther going to take me out of business or I am going to have to lower your hours.

So he looks at his full-time employees and says, sorry, you are part time. You are 28 hours, you are 28 hours, you are 28 hours. Well, he needs more employees to fill up the production. So he goes and hires more part-time workers. Well, that is a good thing for some people, but those who had a full-time job and were getting time and a half overtime and they get their hours cut, the person who was working 50 hours now is down to 28, they have to go get another part-time job that maybe is another 28 hours. Now they are up to 56 or 60 hours, but they don't have health insurance with two jobs. Maybe that is dad, and mom is the same circumstance. She has been cut. She has got to have another job.

So now we have mom and dad trying to raise a family when each were working 50 hours a week with some overtime, now they are working 56 hours a week in two jobs with transportation and the shuttle of schedules, four jobs for two people to raise a family.

Those circumstances are emerging today under ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it is wrong. We need to raise that minimum, that 30-hour standard for full time, that mandate up to 40. That is an essential component of ObamaCare. I would attach that to the debt ceiling. Any one of these, one at a time, all together, I'm fine with, a 40-hour workweek.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, is this, full deductibility for everyone's health insurance premium. It has always been wrong that a certain percentage of the American populace has had to buy their health insurance with aftertax dollars. I have done this for years. As an employer, I started a construction company in 1975. I provided health insurance for our employees, but I couldn't deduct the premium for me unless I incorporated, put myself on a salary and wrote off those wages. I wanted to stay a sole proprietor for a number of reasons, but I couldn't deduct my health insurance premiums.

I would write off the business expense of premiums for my employees, a legitimate expense just like wages, salary, and benefits, write those off. But I couldn't write off my own. So Marilyn and I had to pay for health insurance with aftertax dollars, that piece that is left after you pay Uncle Sam, after you pay the Governor, the take-home pay so to speak. After you pay the payroll tax, the take-home pay is what I had to pay my health insurance with—not a deductible.

Now, here we are in the circumstance where that is bad, and it should have been changed a long time ago because it is an injustice and an inequity, but now we have ObamaCare that mandates that individuals buy that health insurance. It is a Federal mandate: you shall buy this health insurance. Now, in my case, it isn't that I go out on the marketplace and shop for a health insurance policy. It is that if I am going

to comply with the law, I have got one choice and one choice only, and that is not competition. By the way, one of the reasons that the President wanted to pass ObamaCare is so that there would be more competition. He wanted to have a Federal health insurance company to compete with the private sector companies so that there would be more competition. I don't know if anybody has talked about this in quite some time here on the floor. It is the President's plan.

Well, I had one choice, but to have the Federal Government impose that you buy a product that is either produced or approved by the Federal Government, and they take it out of your check. They commandeer your take-home pay to pay that premium. While that is going on, an employer somewhere off in a large corporation can deduct that same premium for all their people as a business expense. But ma and pa operations, the family farm, whoever it might be, they can't. It puts them at a significant disadvantage.

This country needs to provide for full deductibility of everybody's health insurance premiums. It is immoral to compel someone to buy a product that is produced or approved by the Federal Government, and it is even more immoral, Mr. Speaker, to say to them, and the money that you shall pay shall be aftertax dollars, and I am going to send the IRS in to audit you and make sure that you are paying that premium with aftertax dollars, and if not, we are going to levy a tax against you. It was just going to be a penalty, but now it is convenient to make the argument before the Supreme Court that it is a tax.

I have a whole series of things that we could do. The debt ceiling is in front of us. There is an increase that is being pushed at us. If the President's people in this Congress think a clean debt ceiling is a good idea, they should step up and all of them pledge to vote for it. I think we might find enough Republicans that would vote for a clean debt ceiling increase. If not, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we put a balanced budget amendment on that and send it over to HARRY REID. If that doesn't work, then I would suggest that we resurrect Ron Paul's legislation to audit the Fed, attach that to the debt ceiling, and send it over there. If that doesn't work, then I would put the elimination of the bailouts for health insurance companies on there and send it over to the Senate. If that doesn't work, then I would take the 30-hour workweek, which is supposedly the standard for full time, I would change that to 40 so that mom and dad who were working 50 hours, and now they are working 56 hours or 60 hours each, can hang on to just one job, not two each, and they would get, instead of having their hours cut from 50 to 28, or maybe even 40 to 28, they can keep their full-time job and go to work and manage their lives and their schedules.

By the way, this argument that, according to the CBO, ObamaCare cuts

the job equivalent of 2½ million jobs over the course of a decade, that is also appalling and breathtaking, Mr. Speaker. To think that this ObamaCare that was going to create 4 million jobs according to then-Speaker PELOSI now is going to reduce by 2½ million jobs, that is 6½ million jobs off from what was predicted compared to what we now have a better look at what we are likely to end up with, and I won't say that number is certain, it might be substantially greater than that—2½ million jobs.

So how does the administration spin this? You would think that they would find an alternative number and argue the CBO score. Or you would think that they would find a way to point out that somehow these definitions don't quite match up just right. Oh, they looked around pretty hard to find a way to rebut the CBO's numbers and they came up empty. So they settled on the spin, the spin, Mr. Speaker, which is this: oh, 2½ million jobs, think of this: all of those people that don't have to work much because we are borrowing money from the Chinese to subsidize the health insurance premium that we require that they pay to buy the insurance under ObamaCare, and so they will understand that if they stay under a certain threshold, they will get a Federal premium subsidy to buy their ObamaCare. It won't pay for them to work as many hours as they did before, and when you reduce this all down and get people under the 30-hour workweek, which I just finished discussing, then they will have more time to spend with their families, more time to play with their children, more time to paint and more time to muse about the esoteric things in life. Maybe we will have more people that are pontificating about metaphysics for this price of losing 2½ million jobs. Oh, it is a good thing we have people working less in America.

That is the core argument for this administration: it is a good thing that we have people working less in America because of ObamaCare. It gives them more free time. Well, if working less is a good idea, I guess that fits with their philosophy, because we have heard, we have heard from the minority whip as well as a number of other people, in fact, I believe it would also be the former Speaker, who say this: Food stamps and unemployment are the two quickest ways you get economic stimulus, the quickest way to grow the economy.

Now, when I first heard that, it was shocking to me that anybody could say that out loud and perhaps believe it. How do food stamps stimulate the economy? How do unemployment checks stimulate the economy? An economy has to produce goods and services that have a marketable value here and abroad, and if you borrow money abroad to pay people not to produce goods and services, let alone those with a marketable value, you are building a nation of debt and a nation of people who, if they have job skills,

are atrophying because they are not using them, and as technology increases, they get further and further behind by not maintaining the skills they have and not keeping their skills up to date with technology as it moves.

This idea that this is only a consumer-driven economy, this Keynesian concept of let's just say we can't audit the Fed, but they can inject in QE 1, 2, and 3 trillions of dollars into this economy, and because a lot of the world is afraid to invest, therefore, we haven't seen inflation take hold in this way yet. But the Fed can inject the money into QE 3, and then the Federal Government can do an economic stimulus plan like the President's \$825 billion that went north of that, I guess it was \$787 billion that got to 825 billion, inject this money into the economy, spend this money, and it is going to stimulate the economy, and this growth will eventually create enough tax money that you work your way out of debt.

The problem with that is, Mr. Speaker, it has never succeeded. There is no existing model of a Keynesian experiment that has ever brought a country and economy out of an economic recession. We are in the fifth year of this recovery. I guess you can say that we are coming out of the economic recession of 2008. We have had this slow improvement in unemployment numbers that has taken place. We are down there in the sixes somewhere. We have watched as the number of 15 million unemployed has worked its way down by 1 million here, 1 million there. One year ago, there were 12 million unemployed. Today, according to the most recent report, there are 10.2 million unemployed. Actually, it has been a full 2 million people less on the unemployment roles. But the monthly job increases that we have seen, 74,000 last month, a little over 100,000 this month, are not nearly enough to keep pace, Mr. Speaker.

This growth has been down there to where if you look at the last 4 to 5 years, the GDP increase in the economy has been greater in Mexico than it has in the United States. As I listened to some of the, let me say some of the self-appointed economic experts, they will explain to us that we need to import more people into the United States that have low or no skill and likely are illiterate in their own language to do the work that Americans don't want to do in this country, and in doing so will stimulate our economy and increase our fertility rate. We know who those people are, Mr. Speaker, that seem to think that. Much of this concept is just simply wrong. Keynesian economics is wrong. The idea of an open borders economic stimulator is wrong.

What is right is the understanding of first principles, the understanding of the pillars of American exceptionalism, the understanding that put those parameters in place by our Founding Fathers well more than 200 years ago,

when they saw that we had to have the rule of law in America. Without the rule of law, we are not a lot different from Third World countries.

We are a nation of laws and not of men, and our laws need to be applied equally to all of us. The problem we have today is it looks like those who are let's say not favored by the current administration have to fear the law more than those who are favored. One of those examples would be the IRS, Mr. Speaker. Our Founding Fathers would have never envisioned an IRS in the first place. It took a constitutional amendment to even provide for it, the 16th Amendment. I introduce a resolution each year to repeal the 16th Amendment, and one day I hope to see that done.

In the meantime, our Founding Fathers imagined that there would be taxes gathered through other means and that the government would be limited. Our Constitution is the very description of limited government. The concept of Federalism, Mr. Speaker, sometimes needs to be defined and described, especially so young people understand. Federalism is the devolution of power out to the political subdivisions, to the States or respectively to the people, a limited Federal Government with enough power to protect our borders and our shores, to leave us as much as possible otherwise alone, and let the States and their political subdivisions and the people solve those problems so that the laboratories of the States can be where the experiments are taking place.

They are to some degree. I see some of these experiments. There are some States that have some healthy experiments. One of them is Texas: no income tax, a dynamic economy, one that has shown, that has demonstrated to be a big chunk of the growth in our GDP and the growth of employment in the country because they run a free and fair government in Texas and no income tax. Florida is a State with no income tax. South Dakota is a State with no income tax. They seem to be destination States for people that are seeking to get out of the high-tax States like Illinois and California, the model of the States that are in economic difficulty.

□ 2030

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we have seen some cities that have been run by that Keynesian philosophy of borrow, tax, and spend get to the point of collapse and ruin, Detroit among them. Detroit, a great, great, American city with a tremendous legacy, a vibrant tone within the history of America, shuffled down into bankruptcy, and with grass growing in the streets of the city because they didn't take care of their finances. That is what is in store for entire States if they don't turn the corner, and that is what is in store for this entire country if we don't turn the corner.

I am concerned that politics here in the House of Representatives is down-

stream from the culture. Politics in any legislative body is generally downstream from the culture. Yes, we have leaders here. We have leaders that step up and strike the right tone and chart the right course, but they would not be followed unless the culture provided the directive.

This American experiment, this grand country that we are, is dependent upon the people in this country understanding what made us great, preserving and protecting and refurbishing those pillars of American exceptionalism that can sustain a greatness into the future, above and beyond any that we have achieved today.

That is what is in store for us if we teach our children well, if we teach them the responsibility of work, if we teach them the core of our faith, the faith that laid the foundation for America, the faith that will see us through any trials, the foundation for the family, the ideal way to raise children, a mom and dad and a family, raising their children with love and setting the standard for them, and setting the standard of work as well as morality.

This country can come back again. We need to teach American history, the pillars of American exceptionalism. We need to do it from inside out, from the family on out, and those young people need to emerge as the leaders in all walks of life from the educational to the journalism to the production, and we need to revere and respect all work. All work has honor. All work has dignity. We need to put a lot more Americans back to work. There are over 101 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce. We don't need to import more people to do the work that Americans won't do. We need to provide the incentive for Americans to step up and shoulder the burden with the rest of us. That is more important.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will see how the debt ceiling unfolds. I have offered a number of options, and I appreciate your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3193, CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-350) on the resolution (H. Res. 475) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations

issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from February 13, 2014, through February 24, 2014; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS ADDRESSES RAISING DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor and a privilege to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and to anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order in partnership with my coanchor, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), where for the next 60 minutes members of the Congressional Black Caucus will have the opportunity to speak directly to the American people about an issue of great consequence and great significance for our country, for our economy, for our future, and for our well-being, and that is the debt ceiling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a Yogi Berra moment. It is *deja vu* all over again.

Time and time and time again we have been forced to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and urge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to plunge this country into a painful default and risk the full faith and credit of the United States of America for the first time in the history of the Republic.

Whenever we have been forced to have this conversation, we are always put into a position where we need to clarify what the debt ceiling is really all about because it has been subject to a lot of misrepresentation. The debt ceiling is not a forward-looking vehicle that is designed to give the President the opportunity to spend more; it is a backward-looking vehicle designed to give the President the opportunity to pay bills that the Congress has already incurred: bills that were incurred during the previous decade, bills that were incurred during the 8 years of the Bush administration during which time our good friends on the other side of the aisle were in control of both the House and the Senate, and we will go into that in greater detail as we move forward.